

**‘Was ever a book written under greater difficulty?’:  
On the Parallels between Frank Hardy’s *Power without Glory*  
and John Steinbeck’s *The Grapes of Wrath***

DANICA CERCE  
Univeristy of Ljubljana, Slovenia

In his Introduction to a 1991 edition of *Power without Glory*, Jack Lindsay observes that many novelists have elicited a forceful reaction from the public by exposing various aspects of life that powerful interests would prefer to suppress. Lindsay writes that hardly any other Australian novel has had ‘such a violent and tempestuous career at every moment of its writing, printing and initial publication as Frank Hardy’s *Power without Glory*’ (9). I will argue, however, that a parallel to the sensational hue and cry that erupted over Hardy’s novel can be found in the United States in the reception given to John Steinbeck’s *The Grapes of Wrath*, and that the two novels also share other important similarities.

A juxtaposition of the novels by Hardy and Steinbeck is particularly relevant when considered in terms of the role of literature and literary criticism in totalitarian Eastern Europe, which was characterised by the all-permeating ideologies of Marxism and Leninism. Whereas many contemporary critics agree that just as it is impossible to neglect the political implications of literary masterpieces and thereby dispute Nietzsche’s proposition that the aesthetic is the only justification for the world (*Birth of Tragedy* 33), so it is wrong to believe, with Constantin Noica and Lucian Blaga, among others, that ‘all things are political’, and on this basis, to replace literary assessments with political/cultural imperatives. The few critical voices defending the relevance of aesthetics in interpreting literature during the years following the communist takeover in Eastern Europe were outnumbered by those who embraced the need for politically and ideologically committed reading (Guran 96).<sup>1</sup> It is therefore not surprising, given the partisanship of Hardy and Steinbeck in favour of ‘the workers’ and their strong sense of indignation at the labour situation, that both novels were read simplistically and tendentiously, and used as political tools. This article will explore how—despite apparently different motives behind writing their novels—the two authors produced texts that not only added significantly to the Depression era’s socially conscious art, but also left their mark on international literature for many years to come.

This achievement is particularly noteworthy because neither Hardy nor Steinbeck thought of himself as blessed with natural talent. As will be discussed, *Power without Glory* and *The Grapes of Wrath* offer a compelling case for a comparative study in this regard, since during the composition of each novel the writer’s gaze was often directed toward critiquing his own—supposedly inadequate—performance.

Given that Australian readers are in general more familiar with Hardy and his political novel of great dramatic sweep, *Power without Glory* (1950), than with Steinbeck’s controversial

*The Grapes of Wrath* (1939), it is appropriate to commence with a short account of the background and a brief plot summary of the latter. Winner of the 1940 Pulitzer Prize and cornerstone of the writer's 1962 Nobel Prize award, *The Grapes of Wrath* is the third of Steinbeck's major works on the Great Depression, being preceded by *In Dubious Battle* (1936) and *Of Mice and Men* (1937). Steinbeck conceived the novel while on his first journalistic assignment for the *San Francisco News* in the autumn of 1936, when he was sent to the Arvin Encampment in Bakersfield to report on the migrant workers' situation in California.<sup>2</sup> His first attempts to write about the migrants' miserable living conditions were unsuccessful, including an unfinished novel *The Oklahomans*, and the completed, but destroyed *L'Affaire Lettuceberg*. It was not before witnessing the deplorable situation in Visalia and Nipomo in the winter of 1938, where after three weeks of steady rain thousands of families were marooned by floods, that Steinbeck realised that neither *The Oklahomans* nor the proposed magazine article could adequately illustrate the injustices he had observed. His deep personal depression and the desire for his own brand of artistic vengeance crystallised in *The Grapes of Wrath*.

The novel follows the movement of thousands of dispossessed workers in search of a society which would 'let the hungry people eat their produce' (*The Grapes of Wrath* 476). Its power does not lie only in its searing portrait of Dust Bowl poverty. If the novel was merely an historical tract—as one might wrongly assume on the basis of a post-publication nationwide publicity campaign mounted by the Associated Farmers and California Citizens Association to discredit the 'migrant menace'—it would not have sold more than 14 million copies since its conception, and it would not continue to sell over 100,000 copies a year some fifty years after first publication (Shillinglaw 145). *The Grapes of Wrath* is also a moving personal account of a farming family, the Joads, who have been driven off their farmstead in Oklahoma's dying Dust Bowl and forced to travel west. The novel tells of their indomitable spirit and ability to persevere; and of their gradual transformation from selfish individualists, as they are presented in the opening pages of the novel, to humanitarians capable of communal love.

As a number of critics have observed, *The Grapes of Wrath* deals with two key relationships. One is between Tom Joad and Jim Casy, a preacher, who after leaving his Christian calling finds spiritual meaning in social commitment, and the other is between Ma Joad and her self-centred daughter Rose of Sharon. Just like her brother Tom, Rose must learn to look beyond herself and her own needs, and to embrace the needs of others. The novel is thus also a plea for empathy and understanding, as well as a fierce critique of a system that dehumanizes those at the bottom of the socio-economic hierarchy and strips them of human dignity.

At first glance, *The Grapes of Wrath* and *Power without Glory* seem to offer an excellent test case for differences rather than similarities. As discussed, the former describes the American migrant labourers' desperate pilgrimage to the promised land in the 1930s, exposing their deplorable living conditions and the inhuman capitalist practices of the conglomerate of agribusinesses, while the latter depicts urban Australia from the 1890s to the late 1940s, unveiling the double-dealing role of social democrats and the hypocrisy with which the Roman Catholic Church attempted to conceal its political aims. One portrays the Oklahoma farming family, the Joads, in their struggle for survival; the other depicts a notoriously

wealthy and powerful Melbourne entrepreneur, John West, and his insatiable lust for power. While the narrative drive of Hardy's novel stems from the writer's strong political commitment (upon publication of the novel, Hardy was a declared communist), the strength of *The Grapes of Wrath*—according to Steinbeck's assertion in a 1952 Voice of America radio interview—derives from the author's anger 'at people who were doing injustices to other people' (Benson 442).<sup>3</sup>

Nonetheless, despite these apparent differences, the two novels share a wide array of common traits. In addition to such easily recognisable parallels as the novels' imposing length (both over 600 pages in standard editions), their tripartite division, and their straightforward chronological narratives, both demonstrate the authors' intimate knowledge of the working people's habits, attitudes, gestures and nuances of dialect. Moreover, both books reflect their author's sympathetic understanding of the psychology of the downtrodden and the deprived. This is hardly surprising, given that both Hardy and Steinbeck were born into working-class families and experienced childhoods marked by deprivation.

What is surprising, however, is the echoing similarity between each author's arduous journey towards their novel's completion, marked by a shared affinity between their work drive, aspirations, fears, self-doubts and obstacles during and after the conception of the novels. In a striking parallel, both writers revealed their various insecurities in an accompanying study to their novels—Hardy in *The Hard Way* and Steinbeck in *Working Days: The Journal of The Grapes of Wrath*.<sup>4</sup> And last, but not least, although general readers seem to prize the two novels much more than literary critics do, *Power without Glory* and *The Grapes of Wrath* are similar in their capacity to ensure maximum affective impact even decades after their conception.

As discussed by Letitia Guran, referring to George Levine and other comparativists interested in the relevance of the aesthetic model in Romania and other totalitarian countries in the 1980s, the history of the discipline shows that literature and literary discourses have the potential to either reinforce structures of domination and suppression, or to 'disrupt the exercise of power' (96). Numerous examples demonstrate that during the era of communist imposition, a genuine work of art was worth at least as much as any major political act, and could be used to further the utopian communist model of social improvement. Because of the utilitarian conception of what constitutes the literary and the assimilation of literature to ideology, the value of any literary text depended more on external criteria and its socio-political function than on 'the influence it exercises on writers to come' (Guran 97).<sup>5</sup> Clearly, the production and reading of literary texts were strictly controlled by a state. It was probably because of its accord with communist rhetoric based on optimism and social realism that the first Australian book translated in Slovenia, which previously belonged to the former communist state of Yugoslavia, was Frank Hardy's *Power without Glory*.<sup>6</sup> Whereas the Slovene translation of this novel appeared with a considerable time lag (as late as 1961), Russian, Hungarian and German versions were published as early as 1952; in Romania and Czechoslovakia, the novel was translated in 1954. It is of no small significance that Hardy's novel *But the Dead Are Many*, written in the context of the crisis of the world communist movement and reflecting the author's changed attitudes towards the practices of the Communist Party, is still virtually unknown to East European readers.<sup>7</sup>

In terms of American literature, John Steinbeck has had a similar position. Not only did his popularity in the countries of the Eastern bloc surpass that in his home country, his works, too, were (mis)interpreted by the state-controlled reviewers and used for propaganda purposes, or relegated to dusty shelves if they did not meet their expectations. Whereas *The Grapes of Wrath* made Steinbeck a household name and was available to Eastern European readers in their mother-tongue soon after its publication in the United States (as early as 1941 in Czechoslovakia, 1943 in Slovenia, 1947 in Slovakia, 1949 in Poland, and two years later in Croatia, to mention only a few countries of communist Europe), his earlier *In Dubious Battle* (1936) was among many others consigned to oblivion because of its undesirable adverse political potential.<sup>8</sup>

This ideologically biased reception of their work is just one of the parallels between Hardy and Steinbeck, as the output of the two authors displays a number of common features—from thematic and structural parallels; resemblance in symbolism, imagery and elements of characterization; to affinities in dialogue and stylistic devices that characterize their prose in general.<sup>9</sup> Moreover, both writers were strongly susceptible to social necessity and the conjunctive pressures of history and geography. Their pervasive sense of artistic inadequacy that was symptomatic of both of them, did not suppress their creative impulses, which were fuelled by the urge to tell their stories of the depression honestly and movingly. As Frank Hardy told Tony Morphet in 1967, he ‘became a writer as an emotional reaction to the depression [...] and his commitment to be a writer was a political one, literature as a weapon’ (15). Nowhere else did Hardy better achieve his aim than in *Power without Glory*, because it is in this book that he conducts a double-edged witch-hunt—one against the institutions of the so-called democratic state, and the other against those who use the Labor Party to gain personal power and wealth. Similarly, in his interview with Joseph Henry Jackson prior to the publication of *The Grapes of Wrath* (1939), Steinbeck proposed that the artist is obliged to ‘come forward [...] when he is needed to express a group’s pressing needs’ (DeMott 148). True to Steinbeck’s belief, by uncompromisingly exposing the capitalist dynamics of corporate farming, *The Grapes of Wrath* beneficially contributed to the Depression era’s working-class literature.

Moreover, this shared sense of their role as mediators in contemporary social struggles did not prevent Hardy and Steinbeck from producing books with a lasting impact. As mentioned earlier, Steinbeck started his lengthy excursion into the migrant workers’ problems as a critical commentator for *San Francisco News*, but eventually the intensity of his engagement deepened, resulting in his changed attitude from ‘a methodical reporter to a literary activist’ (DeMott xxxviii). According to Jack Lindsay, Hardy, too, intended to follow ‘a national tradition of journalistic audacity, though he wanted to produce a work which rose far above any level of journalistic muck-raking and succeeded in marrying a strong social purpose to a high artistic aim’ (11-12). However, from the outset, the social consciousness of the two novels was the source of the uncompromising reactions from critics with a clear preference for aesthetic or literary merit. And whereas such literary and academic critics were likely to dismiss the novels as sentimental, unconvincing and lacking in literary sophistication, they were also highly praised by those who embraced the need for politically and ideologically committed reading.<sup>10</sup>

Although the past decades have not produced a consensus about the exact nature of the two writers' literary achievement—their fortunes have seemingly fluctuated according to prevailing ideologies and the expectations of their readers—more recent analysis is likely to agree that both writers owe their fame and recognition more to the fact that their writing embodies the shape of their political affiliations rather than to the literary virtues with which the novels are expressed. This is particularly relevant for *Power without Glory* and *The Grapes of Wrath*, in that each of them was a task that fully commanded the author's energy and attention. Steinbeck claimed on 11 June 1938 that, 'For the first time I am working on a book that is not limited and that will take every bit of experience and thought and feeling that I have' (*Working Days* 26). A day earlier, he wrote: 'This must be a good book. It simply must. [...] It must be far and away the best thing I have ever attempted – slow, but sure, piling detail on detail until a picture and an experience emerge. Until the whole throbbing thing emerges. And I can do it. I feel very strong to do it' (25). The 20 October 1938 entry closes with the sentence: 'Funny where the energy comes from. Now to work, only now it isn't work anymore' (91). While his doubts about his ability to carry out the plan of his ambitious novel emerged repeatedly, Steinbeck rarely questioned the risks of bringing his whole sensibility to bear upon his writing. In September 1938, he wrote in his journal: 'This book is my life. When it is done, then will be the time for another life' (77). Similarly, in *The Hard Way*, Hardy's third person narrator reveals that 'there was no risk he wouldn't take, no hardship he wouldn't endure. The job became a thing in itself' (45); and that, 'He was obsessed with *Power without Glory*, gave no thought to anything else, even to how it could be published' (121).

Despite writing out of the intense presence of their whole selves, neither Steinbeck nor Hardy produced what can be considered a challenging literary text. Rather, it is the authors' strength of vision, coupled with their anger fuelled by righteous indignation and creative urgency that provide the novels' capacity to elicit powerful audience responses. Indeed, both books were highly acclaimed by the left for their documentary integrity and social necessity, and at the same time fiercely attacked by right-wing politicians as immoral and deceptive. At times it is hard to believe that critics and reviewers were responding to the same texts. The evocative power of the two novels is evident in their immediate reception in political circles. *The Grapes of Wrath* was given historical vindication by Senator Robert M. La Follette's inquiries into California's farm labour conditions and was passionately defended also by Eleanor Roosevelt, while *Power without Glory* brought Hardy to the Supreme Court of Victoria on a charge of Criminal Libel. In Clement Semmler's words, 'the Victorian government was determined to shut him [Hardy] up, in both senses' (13). The reasons for this are not difficult to comprehend—one of the paragraphs in *Power without Glory* reads:

If all men are of the same opinion as myself, then the proclamation will be valueless. [...]. It is not agitators who make revolutions. Revolutions spring from the very hearts of the people; these men are the leaders of the people, and because of that the enemies of the people fear and hate them. (293)

*Power without Glory* was published when the dispute around the Communist Party Dissolution Bill was at its peak. As a 'novel of exposure', with the main character based on a powerful political and business figure whose career had been built on illegal gambling, it

evoked passions at both ends of the political spectrum (Williams 78). Those who admired the novel became the writer's advocates in the face of a good deal of disparagement, even hatred. Ralph Gibson later observed that Hardy uncovered what 'thousands of people had been talking about for years in pubs and street corners, but never dreamt of seeing in print,'<sup>11</sup> while Jack Beasley noted that the identification of figures who Hardy had exposed in his novel became a 'major spectator sport of the day'. Beasley also wrote that, 'Before Turner, Oscar Wilde is reputed to have said, there was no London fog. Similarly, nobody had ever seen Melbourne as Hardy did' (59).

As there were many reasons for the novel's Australian appeal, so there were for its worldwide popularity. Letters of support streamed in to join forces with the local campaign. Howard Fast, writing from New York, must have had Steinbeck's novel in mind when he wrote: 'How familiar the whole story sounds in terms of our own scene! [...] How they fear books in these times! How eager they are to destroy the few voices that still speak up with courage and integrity!' (*The Hard Way*, 160). We also find this revealing passage in *The Grapes of Wrath*:

Two are better than one, because they have a good reward for their labor. For if they fall, the one will lif' up his fellow, but woe to him that is alone when he falleth, for he hath not another to help him up. [...] if two lie together, then they have heat: but how can one be warm alone? And if one prevail against him, two shall withstand him, and a three-fold cord is not quickly broken. (570-71)<sup>12</sup>

Steinbeck's novel was met with particularly strong resistance in California, where—according to liberal activist Richard Criley, 'social issues were so sharp [...] and the things were so acute, so terrifying in the need to change' (Shillinglaw 147). Resisting change, the Associated Farmers and the California Citizens Association, supported by banks, oil companies, agricultural land companies, and public utilities, published scores of editorials and pamphlets, and prompted several literary rebuttals to discredit Steinbeck's work and to exonerate the Californian landowners. Each of these works, Shillinglaw observes, defended California against Steinbeck's accusations largely by ignoring much of the agony he described, and dealt with the migrant question without fully comprehending the problem.<sup>13</sup>

Just as in Australia the uproar over *Power without Glory* did not die down after a few weeks, nor a few months, as Hardy had hoped, so too the flurry over *The Grapes of Wrath* lingered in the United States. Spurred by nearly ninety reviews in newspapers, magazines, and literary journals between April (it was published on 14 April) and June, the novel was the number-one best-seller for 1939, selling 428,900 copies in hardcover at \$2.75 each, and it remained among the top sellers for the following year. According to Steinbeck's biographer, Jackson Benson, the novel found 'tens of thousands of readers who had never been exposed to James, Joyce and Farrell, readers who had grown up through the magazines as far as *Gone With the Wind* perhaps, or *So Red the Rose*' (418). Both books have been repeatedly banned in schools and libraries, but widely read. Robert DeMott asserts in his 'Introduction' to *Working Days* (xxiv) that, 'From the moment it was published, *The Grapes of Wrath* has been less judged as novel than as a sociological event, a celebrated political cause, or a factual case study'. In *The Hard Way*, Frank Hardy observes that 'Politicians in the Victorian Parliament began to call their opponents by names in *Power without Glory* instead of their real names [...]. In public bars, cafés, trains and homes up and down the country, people began to speak of *the book* or *that*

book according to the point of view' (141), and that 'The story has become something of a legend' (144). Later he reveals more of the book's notoriety, recalling that, 'copies of the novel were smuggled into jails up and down the country and read illegally [...]. Libraries had waiting lists months long. Stories, bawdy and unprintable, like those that appear mysteriously about all famous occurrences began to spread. Glossaries were issued purporting to equate real names with the fictitious ones in the book [...]. The whole population seems to be talking about *Power without Glory*' (172).

The full extent of the novel's dramatic impact is evidenced by Hardy's observation that, 'Of all possible consequences of writing *Power without Glory* this was the strangest, to be the centre of an argument around what constitutes criminal libel' (*The Hard Way*, 182). Steinbeck's book, too, passed out of the writer's possession, with the author complaining in October 1939 that, '*Grapes* got really out of hand, became a public hysteria and I became a public domain' (*Working Days*, 105).

Paradoxically, both Hardy and Steinbeck struggled with continuing doubts about their writing talent. On more than one occasion Hardy laments, 'No one will want to read the book [...] it is a queer mixture of biography, history and novel, and will appeal to no one' (*The Hard Way*, 135). From *The Hard Way* we can also learn that in the winter of 1948, Hardy had decided to abandon the project, realising that 'he had lived in a world of illusions—he had the ability to gather the material, but not to write it in the form of a novel' (60). Moreover, Hardy claimed that, 'He had learned much in the university of life, but had learned little of the 'inner mysteries' of literature and art and its relation to life' (42). When the book was eventually published, Hardy later confessed in a 1973 interview, that it seemed to provide 'the final proof that I was not a writer' (Molloy 371).

Like Hardy, Steinbeck started with insufficient theoretical or practical knowledge of the novelist's craft. His first novel, *Cup of Gold* (1929), asserts DeMott, 'gave no indication' that the writer would ever be capable of writing a novel with the power of *The Grapes of Wrath* (150). It is widely agreed that despite Steinbeck's artistic growth in the ten years between the two books, 'the primary impetus of his fiction was always to tell the story—before the crafting' (Timmerman 5). Steinbeck, too, was aware of his inadequacies as a writer, revealing in mid-June 1938; 'If only I could do this book properly [...], but I am assailed with my own ignorance and inability [...]. For no one else knows my lack of ability the way I do. I am pushing against it all the time' (*Working Days*, 30). And about two months later he noted that, 'I'm not a writer. I've been fooling myself and other people [...]. I hope this book is some good, but I have less and less hope of it' (56, 63). His diary entry for 1 September 1938 opens: 'Was ever a book written under greater difficulty?' (63).

Perhaps it was also because of Hardy's and Steinbeck's constantly expressed self-accusations and criticism of their own abilities that critics were quick to question the artistry of their texts and to deny that they could be read from a cultural, geographical, or historical distance. For many years, both novels were much underrated. In 1999, DeMott writes in *The Steinbeck Newsletter* that there is evidence to suggest that '*The Grapes*' stock may be rising' given its good rating on three very different American lists of the books of 'great merit' in the United

States (22). Similarly, Jack Lindsay observed that *Power without Glory* 'has now begun to conquer its place in the literary history as a work of striking originality, force and depth' (21).

It is true that neither Steinbeck nor Hardy was an elite literary practitioner or formal innovator, but they still achieved in *The Grapes of Wrath* and *Power without Glory* a powerful fusion of documentary and fiction, the expository and lyrical, the objective and subjective, elements that successfully coalesce to provide for the capacious dimensionality of the two novels. Despite the criticism that has been made of them, both books emerge as genuine twentieth-century epics, whose meaning and vision are not contingent upon the time or place of their writing. In accordance with George Levine's view in 'Reclaiming the Aesthetic' that works of art are able to produce critical disruptions and generate alternative worlds, they encouraged national self-reflection and, it could be argued, helped to create a meaningful existence for individuals faced with deprivation (384). As such, each novel became an indispensable element in a phase in the cultural and social formatting of their countries. Because of their qualities of honesty, integrity, emotional urgency and evocative power, *Power without Glory* and *The Grapes of Wrath* speak to the larger experience of human disenfranchisement and continue to evoke powerful emotional and cognitive reactions in their readers.

All of these factors speak in favour of the contention that despite the differences in their plots and contexts, *Power without Glory* and *The Grapes of Wrath* have much in common. Not only because they were both written 'under greater difficulty' than perhaps other books that dealt with such problematic epochal conditions, but also because in both cases the book passed out of its author's possession and became a product shaped by the cultural and intellectual forces of its times.

## NOTES

- <sup>1</sup> Letitia Guran refers to George Levine's 'Reclaiming the Aesthetic' in David H. Richter's *Falling into Theory: Conflicting Views on Reading Literature*, 378.
- <sup>2</sup> The immediate result of this assignment was a seven-part series of hard-hitting articles 'The Harvest Gypsies,' published in *San Francisco News* from October 5-7, 1936.
- <sup>3</sup> Jackson J. Benson, Steinbeck's biographer, claims in his *The True Adventures of Steinbeck, Writer* that at this point of his career, Steinbeck was not very much interested in doctrinaire political theories. In Benson's view, there is no proof that Steinbeck ever was a member of the Communist Party. In his 'Carol: The Woman Behind the Man', Benson writes that Steinbeck's first wife Carol, who played a very important role when Steinbeck was writing the novel, was much more politically radical than the writer.
- <sup>4</sup> *The Hard Way* was published in 1961, although Hardy composed it immediately after the publication of the novel. As its title suggests, *Working Days: The Journals of The Grapes of Wrath*, was composed daily, during the process of writing the novel. It was not published, however, until 1989.
- <sup>5</sup> Letitia Guran refers to Harold Bloom's view expressed in H. David Richter's *Falling Into Theory: Conflicting Views on Reading Literature*, that the ultimate test of one's place in the canon is 'whether enduring poets are emerging from their influence' (229).
- <sup>6</sup> Slovenia became a sovereign democratic republic in 1991.



- <sup>7</sup> To Slovene readers, the novel was introduced by Danica Cerce in 'Frank Hardy: *Toda mrtvih je veliko* - Pronicljiva studija o ideoloski predanosti' ('Frank Hardy's *But the Dead Are Many*: A Penetrating Study of Party Mindedness').
- <sup>8</sup> As discussed in Danica Cerce's, 'Art for Politics: The Political Dimension of Steinbeck's Works in Eastern Europe,' in Eastern Europe *In Dubious Battle* can be purchased only in second-hand book shops. In the Czech Republic, for example, the novel was translated in 1945 and 1959, while in Slovenia and Romania it has not been reprinted since first publication in 1952 and 1958 respectively. It has not yet been translated in Poland, Slovakia or Croatia.
- <sup>9</sup> For a detailed analysis of these similarities between the two authors see Danica Cerce, 'Makers of myth'.
- <sup>10</sup> Despite their reputation as advocates for the workers' cause, neither Hardy nor Steinbeck produced what committed activists considered fully radicalized novels. In 'The Hero of My Life' Jack Beasley laments the lack of a distinctive political synthesis and a positive revolutionary hero in *Power without Glory*. For critical reception of Steinbeck's *The Grapes of Wrath* in totalitarian Slovenia and Czechoslovakia see Danica Cerce's 'The Perception of Steinbeck's Work in Slovenia', and Petr Kopecký's 'The Story of John Steinbeck in Communist Czechoslovakia'.
- <sup>11</sup> See R. H. Cavenagh's *The Fiction of Frank Hardy*, 60.
- <sup>12</sup> In *The Hard Way*, Hardy writes: 'One source of courage is to belong, to be committed, to have friends and supporters. Much is made in modern literature of the courage of the solitary man [...] overcoming his inner fear. But this is the courage of primitive, non-social man, or of the isolated man in individualist society. Social man can find courage within himself only if he unites with other men to recognize and overcome the tyranny of social necessity and compulsion' ( 81).
- <sup>13</sup> Susan Shillinglaw mentions works including, Ruth Comfort Mitchell's *Of Human Kindness* (1940); Marshall Hartranft's *Grapes of Gladness: California's Refreshing and Inspiring Answer to John Steinbeck's 'Grapes of Wrath'* (1939); Sue Sander's 'The Real Causes of Our Migrant Problem' (1940), and Frank J. Taylor's 'The Merritt System' (1938).

## WORKS CITED

- Benson, Jackson J. *The True Adventures of John Steinbeck, Writer*. New York: Viking P, 1984.
- . 'Carol: The Woman Behind the Man.' *The Monterey Herald Weekend Magazine*, 10 June 1984, 3-6.
- Beasley, Jack. 'The Hero of My Own Life.' *Red Letter Days*. Sydney: Australasian Book Society, 1979. 55-95.
- Bloom, Harold. 'Elegiac Conclusion.' *Falling Into Theory: Conflicting Views on Reading Literature*. Ed. H. David Richter. Boston/ New York: Bedford/ St. Martin's, 2000. 225-35.
- Cavenagh, R. H. 'The Fiction of Frank Hardy.' Diss. University of New England, 1972.
- Cerce, Danica. 'Makers of Myths: John Steinbeck and Frank Hardy.' *Steinbeck and His Contemporaries*. Eds. Stephen K. George and Barbara Heavilin. Lanham: Scarecrow P, 2007. 247-254.

- . 'Art for Politics: The Political Dimension of Steinbeck's Works in Eastern Europe.' *A John Steinbeck Reader: Essays in Honor of Stephen K. George*. Ed. Barbara A. Heavilin. Lanham, Toronto, Plymouth, 2009. 97-105.
- . 'Frank Hardy: *Toda mrtvih je veliko* - Pronicljiva studija o ideoloski predanosti.' *Vestnik* 1-2 (2000): 447-60.
- . 'The Perception of Steinbeck's Work in Slovenia.' *Steinbeck Review* 3/2 (2006): 63-78.
- DeMott, Robert. 'Introduction.' *Working Days: The Journal of 'The Grapes of Wrath,' 1938-1941*. By John Steinbeck. Ed. Robert DeMott. New York: Viking P, 1989. xxi-lvii.
- . *Steinbeck's Typewriter: Essays on His Art*. Troy, New York: Whitston Publishing Company, 1997.
- . 'The Status of *The Grapes of Wrath*.' *The Steinbeck Newsletter* (Spring 1999): 22.
- Guran, Letitia. 'The Aesthetic Dimension of American-Romanian Comparative Literary Studies.' *The Comparatist* 27 (2003): 94-115.
- Hardy, Frank. *The Hard Way: The Story Behind 'Power Without Glory.'* Sydney: Australasian Book Society, 1961.
- . *Power without Glory*. Melbourne: Mandarin Australia, 1991 [Melbourne: Realist Printing Publishing Co., 1950].
- . *But the Dead Are Many*. London: Bodley Head, 1975.
- Kopecký, Petr. 'The Story of John Steinbeck in Communist Czechoslovakia.' *Steinbeck Studies* 1/2 (2005): 81-90).
- Levine, George. 'Reclaiming the Aesthetic.' *Falling Into Theory: Conflicting Views on Reading Literature*. Ed. H. David Richter. Boston/ New York: Bedford/ St. Martin's, 2000. 378-91.
- Lindsay, Jack. 'Introduction.' *Power Without Glory*. By Frank Hardy. Melbourne: Mandarin Australia, 1991. 9-21.
- Molloy, Bruce. 'An Interview with Frank Hardy.' *Australian Literary Studies* 7 (October 1976): 357-374.
- Morphett, Tony. 'Frank Hardy on Commitment.' *Quadrant* 11 (1967): 17.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. *The Birth of Tragedy and Other Writings*. Ed. Raymond Geuss and Ronald Speirs. Trans. Ronald Speirs. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1999.
- Semmler, Clement. 'The 'Most Australian Rebel Spun Classy Yarns.' *The Australian* 31 January 1994: 13.
- Shillinglaw, Susan. 'California Answers.' *John Steinbeck: The Years of Greatness, 1936-1939*. Ed. Tetsumaro Hayashi. Tuscaloosa: The U of Alabama P, 1993. 145-164.
- Steinbeck, John. *Working Days: The Journal of 'The Grapes of Wrath,' 1938-1941*. Ed. Robert DeMott. New York: Viking, 1989.
- . *The Grapes of Wrath*. New York: Penguin, 1992 [New York: Viking P, 1939].
- . *In Dubious Battle*. New York: Penguin, 1992 [New York: Covici-Friede, 1936].
- . *The Harvest Gypsies: On the Road to 'The Grapes of Wrath.'* Berkeley: Heyday Books, 1988 [*San Francisco News* 5-7 October 1936].
- Timmerman, John H. *John Steinbeck's Fiction: The Aesthetics of the Road Taken*. Norman: U of Oklahoma P, 1986.
- Williams, Ray. 'Frank Hardy's *Power without Glory*.' *Australian Left Review* 5 (1968): 77-78.